



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

DIGEST OF OTHER RECENT VIRGINIA DECISIONS.

Note.—In this department we give the syllabus of every case decided by the Virginia Supreme Court of Appeals, except of such cases as are reported in full.

UNITED STATES MINERAL CO. v. CAMDEN & DRISCOLL.

March 14, 1907.

[56 S. E. 561.]

1. Corporations—Powers—Purchase of Corporation's Own Stock.—

Where a corporation, on the purchase of property by it, gave the seller, as representing a portion of the price, some of its stock, on an agreement to subsequently purchase the stock, the agreement was not invalid, as, in the absence of statutory prohibition, a corporation may purchase its own stock.

[Ed. Note.—For cases in point, see Cent. Dig. vol. 12, Corporations, § 1530.]

2. Appeal—Review—Failure to Present Question Below.—In reviewing a ruling on a demurrer to the declaration, only those grounds of demurrer relied on by defendant in his written specification in the trial court can be considered.

[Ed. Note.—For cases in point, see Cent. Dig. vol. 2, Appeal and Error, §§ 1226-1230, 1426-1431.]

3. Same—Record—Evidence—Necessity of Bill of Exceptions.—

Where the printed record on appeal contained a statement purporting to be the evidence, and at the end of the statement was a certificate of the trial judge that it was all the evidence in the case, but the statement was not referred to in any bill of exceptions, nor identified in any way by being attached to a bill, it could not be considered.

[Ed. Note.—For cases in point, see Cent. Dig. vol. 3, Appeal and Error, §§ 2433, 2434.]

DAVENPORT v. DAVENPORT.

March 14, 1907.

[56 S. E. 562.]

1. Divorce—Jurisdiction of Cause of Action.—A wife obtained a default decree of divorce, which, on a bill of review by the husband, was set aside. On the refusal to dismiss the bill of review or to set aside the decree entered thereon, the wife, by amending her original bill, met the objection that the statement of the case in the original bill was insufficient to give the court jurisdiction. A demurrer to the amended bill was overruled, and the husband filed a cross-bill, pray-